UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

v.

	Ju	lio Cesar Ventura-Barreto	Case Number: 18-1113MJ-004
		e with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § the following facts are established:(Chec	3142(f), a detention hearing has been submitted to the Court. I ck one or both, as applicable.)
		ear and convincing evidence the defendardant pending trial in this case.	nt is a danger to the community and require the detention of the
\boxtimes		preponderance of the evidence the defedant pending trial in this case.	ndant is a serious flight risk and require the detention of the
		PART I F	INDINGS OF FACT
	(1)	offense that would have been a federal existed) that is: a crime of violence as defined in an offense for which the maxim an offense for which a maximum in	um sentence is life imprisonment or death. In term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed It the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal In the state of local offenses. In victim or that involves the possession or use of a firearm or as are defined in section 921), or any other dangerous weapon, or
	(2)	18 U.S.C. §3142(e)(2)(B): The offens on release pending trial for a federal, st	e described in finding 1 was committed while the defendant was ate or local offense.
	(3)	- ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of m imprisonment) for the offense described in finding 1.
	(4)		n a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of afety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find presumption.
		Alter	native Findings
	(1)	☐ for which a maximum term of ir under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c), 956(a	the cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense: mprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in 1), or 2332b. which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is

¹Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

		\Box an offense involving a minor victim under section
	(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.
		Alternative Findings
\boxtimes	(1)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will flee; no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required.
	(2)	No condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of others and the community.
	(3)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will (obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice) (threaten, injure, or intimidate a prospective witness or juror).
	(4)	intilindate a prospective witness or juror).
	(1)	PART II WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION (Check one or both, as applicable.) I find that the credible testimony and information ³ submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence as to danger that:
\boxtimes	(2)	I find that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:
	, ,	☐ The defendant is not a citizen of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence.
		☐ The defendant, at the time of the charged offense, was in the United States illegally.
		☐ The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.
		☐ The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.
		☐ The defendant has a prior criminal history.
		☐ There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.
		 ☐ The defendant attempted to evade law enforcement contact by fleeing from law enforcement. ☐ The defendant is facing a minimum mandatory of incarceration and a maximum of

²Insert as applicable 18 U.S.C. §§1201, 1591,2241-42, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3, 2252(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.

³The rules concerning admissibility of evidence in criminal trials do not apply to the presentation and consideration of information at the [detention] hearing. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) for the factors to be taken into account.

The defendant does not dispute the information contained in the Pretrial Services Report, except:
In addition: The defendant submitted the issue of detention.

The Court incorporates by reference the findings of the Pretrial Services Agency which were reviewed by the Court at the time of the hearing in this matter.

PART III -- DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his/her designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

PART IV -- APPEALS AND THIRD PARTY RELEASE

IT IS ORDERED that should an appeal of this detention order be filed with the District Court, it is counsel's responsibility to deliver a copy of the motion for review/reconsideration to Pretrial Services at least one day prior to the hearing set before the District Court. Pursuant to Rule 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P., effective December 1, 2009, Defendant shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this order or after the oral order is stated on the record within which to file specific written objections with the district court. Failure to timely file objections in accordance with Rule 59(a) may waive the right to review. 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a release to a third party is to be considered, it is counsel's responsibility to notify Pretrial Services sufficiently in advance of the hearing before the District Court to allow Pretrial Services an opportunity to interview and investigate the potential third party custodian.

Dated this 16th day of February, 2018.

Bridget S. Bade
United States Magistrate Judge